



Lower Woodland Skateboard Park

Community Meeting #2: Conceptual Design Review Meeting Minutes December 13, 2005, 6:00 PM – 7:45 p.m. Green Lake Library

Comments were made concerning the new park from a variety of community members. Several skateboarders attended along with people interested in other uses, and parents and neighbors. The following is a list of comments from the public comment period.

- Concern about planning and the overall budget allocations
- Concern about size vs. budget
- Balance of park, street, and bowls
- Promote and support future skateparks
- Concern about designing basic skill building areas skateboarders in new park
- BMX use within skateparks needs to be addressed on a policy level.
- BMX users would adapt to skaters' needs and BMXers would like to use the park
- Skateboarders are concerned that there would be a declined level of safety if BMX use is allowed in the park
- Skate dancers would like a large flat area to perform. Parks is willing to help locate areas for this opportunity throughout the city, but would like to maximize the limited Lower Woodland site for terrain skating.

Designer Wally Hollyday presented three design options, that he feels all have good elements – his goal at the meeting was to show the audience the options, and discuss which mix of elements were the most well-liked by the community. The final design will result from blending one or more of these three optional designs to meet the needs of users of all skill levels and will provide challenges for them to progress.

He commented that plazas are dual-use: provide a place for “hanging out” and a core area for skating. Each of the three design options includes at least one plaza. Each design also includes a spectator/picnic area, and a spectator/walking path on perimeter.

General comments made about the designs overall:

- Existing lighting can be preserved
- There is existing parking
- Sports fields at the site can create a natural buffer zone between “use areas”.
- There are two existing restroom facilities nearby.

For now, the BMX use issue is tabled. Kim Baldwin encouraged BMX proponents to attend a Park Board meeting to make public comment to our policy-makers.

Wally stated that his main goal is to provide a variety of skate experiences for kids to learn different ways to skate, and for people with a variety of skill levels to experience. He invited questions and comments:

Q: What about green space indicated?

A: Grass is less costly than pouring cement, and works well as a spectator area.

Q: Phase One takes up how much space?

A: Phase One is approx. 19,000 sq. ft. This will be adjusted as other elements factor in but the final will be in this ballpark.

Q: What about maintenance once built?

A: The designer does not include this in project/building costs; Parks assigns a separate cost which comes from a separate budget. Wally feels maintenance will be pretty basic.

C: Skateparks tend to be “self policed” and cleaned up by users.

C: Think about things in Seattle area not drying out very well, and then there are sprinklers. Just a concern about the definition in design options of “turf”, and about wet concrete as a hazard to skaters. Comment is specific to concrete plaza area, and plantings near it which may be watered. (*Wally is open to suggestions on this point*).

C: One person suggested putting astro turf in that area, which does not need watering?!

C: Possible drainage issues where the bowls might be built. (*Wally is aware of these, and does not see it as problematic.*) Parks is having borings done in this area. This is a technical concern that is being addressed at the professional level.

C: Very impressed with the design options, and the details.

Q: What is plan for getting to one final design?

A: In the next portion of this meeting, gather comments about which design and specific elements are seen by the audience as “idea” or less than ideal. Then synthesize designs with comments, and bring final design to the next (and final) public meeting.

Design Options- (community input):

- Hybrid style of Option #2
- Placement of spectator area in #3
- Concern about ‘breaking up the number of steps’ (at plaza)

- Would like to see street rails (round)
- Likes two wedge ramps
- Ameoba bowl design in #1: prefers
- Would like to see a mix of transitions in flow bowl, differing heights
- Like to see some alternate materials, e.g. granite
- Likes reservoir idea, prefers #2
- Likes bowl in #3, it's more "open" and would like to see bigger bowl in #2
- Flow bowl in #1, prefers
- Would like to see a full cradle (for upside down)
- More "spine"
- Beginners and intermediate areas: make them interactive, no buffers
- Mix of tranny radius
- Likes #2 best overall
- No ramps near entrance? (stairs can be walked down, or skated)
- Maybe steps on one side of plaza, for different levels of skaters?

Comment: We're getting 16,000-19,000 sq. ft. of skateable space in Seattle which is great.

Please get involved in fundraising for added elements currently not in the budget.

Ideas for site amenities:

- * Lighting: site already has adequate lighting – possibly add more
- * Tint the concrete with color: might make it less hot in summer, and attractive
- * Water/drinking fountain
- * Food/ concession stand / bbq's / shade / play area / picnic table
- * Family drop-off area in parking: can possibly post 2 – or 5 – minute parking signs ("other end" of parking area was suggested for safety)
- * Storage, or hangers
- * Place for brooms and clean up equipment – possibly a shed with a lock

Next Steps: With any further comments, email project manager Kim Baldwin at: kim.baldwin@seattle.gov . She will pass on comments or questions to landscape architect or to Wally as appropriate.

Watch the project webpage for the first notice of the next, and third, meeting:

www.seattle.gov/parks/maintenance/lowerwoodland.htm